DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 986 JC 790 285

AUTHOR Hansen, Evelyn Unes
TITLE General College Faculty Perceptions of its Individualized Baccalaureate Degree Program. The General College Studies, Volume XV, Number 1. 1978-79.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. General Coll.
PUB DATE Oct 78
NOTE 22p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adjustment Problems; Bachelors Degrees; *College Faculty; Curriculum Development; Faculty Development; Individualized Curriculum; Institutional Research; Job Satisfaction; Junior Colleges; *Organizational Change; *Postsecondary Education; *School Surveys; Student Evaluation; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

In 1970, General College instituted an individualized baccalaureate (B.A.) program. In spring 1978, a survey was conducted to determine faculty attitude and opinion with respect to: (1) the quality of the individualized programs and of student performance; (2) professional development and satisfaction; (3) institutional change and development; (4) curriculum direction, development, and reform; and (5) program development and change. A total of 54 of the 96 faculty advisors responded; of respondents, two-thirds had been affiliates of the College before its metamorphosis from a two-year to a four-year institution. Study findings include the following: faculty supported the B.A. program; faculty agreed that in the development of the curriculum, the needs of the students should be, but have not been, preeminent; they were strongly agreed that the humanities, communications systems, and interdisciplinary studies were in greatest need of development; they had greater confidence in the quality of students' program planning than in their ability to demonstrate skills that are integral to the programs; most agreed on the need for policy refinements; and they agreed that the program contributed to their professional satisfaction and provided them expanded professional opportunity--strongest support in this regard existed among faculty with six to eight years of experience. (MB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

THE GENERAL COLLEGE STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
THE GENERAL COLLEGE
106 Nicholson Hall
215 Pillsbury Drive, S.E.
Minneapolis, Minn. 55455

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

General College

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED169986

JC 790 285

Volume XV, Number 1 1978-79

GENERAL COLLEGE FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF ITS INDIVIDUALIZED BACCALAUREATE DEGREE PROGRAM

Evelyn Unes Hansen

In common with dozens of institutions across the country in the late 1960's, the University of Minnesota reacted to agitation for civil rights, demonstrations against the Vietnamese war, and demands for social justice in America by seeking new ways to give effective attention to the educational needs of by-passed populations and non-traditional students. Agencies proliferated on its campus: Upward Bound, Youth Community, New Careers, Newgate, Experimental College, Martin Luther King Program, University without Walls, HELP Center - and more. The General College, which at that time also administered University College, was associated with all of these ventures.

The experience helped convince the General College faculty that capable non-traditional students have a right to study beyond the two-year degree, that they know and can state what they need to learn, and that individualized programs ought to be available to them if traditional ones are inaccessible or inappropriate. In 1970, therefore, with the consent of the University Senate and the Board of Regents, the faculty of the General College embarked upon a project called Extended Programs - a range of opportunities for university education beyond the sophomore year. The project encompassed occupational or paraprofessional education culminating in certificates, general education to enhance vocational-technical school training, and two new degrees: Bachelor of General Studies (B.G.S.) and Bachelor of Applied Studies (B.A.S.).

The years which followed were demanding but exhilarating. The individualized baccalaureates, for example, proved attractive to an unusually diverse and unexpectedly large population. The experiences of the first years were codified in a policy statement, General College Baccalaureate Program Guidelines, adopted by the faculty in 1976. The following year, the faculty approved an experimental approach to orientation, admission, advising, graduation, and administration. Two publications were prepared to implement the policies embodied in this approach: Core Planning for General College Degrees, by Norman W. Moen and Evelyn U. Hansen; and Planning A General College Baccalaureate Degree Program: An Incremental Discussion and Study Guide, by Evelyn U. Hansen.

The 1977-1978 academic year was devoted to research and evaluation for the purpose of discovering student and faculty attitudes toward the degrees, characteristics of 4-year degree candidates, value of the degrees for employment, promotion, and admission to graduate or professional study, the impact of individualized programs upon faculty advisors, and related matters. This edition of General College Studies presents the first in what will be a series of reports, which, taken together, compose a factual picture of almost ten years' experience with General College individualized baccalaureate degree programs. Norman W. Moen

Editorial Board: The General College Research Group

AN INTERIOR VIEW: FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF THE INDIVIDUALIZED BACCALAUREATE DEGREE PROGRAM OF THE GENERAL COLLEGE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Evelyn Unes Hansen

with research assistance from

Paul J. Feltovich, Ph.D.
Thomas M. Brothen, Ph.D.

University of Minnesota

October, 1978

AN INTERIOR VIEW: FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF THE INDIVIDUALIZED BACCALAUREATE DEGREE PROGRAM OF THE GENERAL COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Evelyn Unes Hansen

Observers of American higher education, like watchers of the evening sky, have noted the meteoric rise of individualized degree programs during the past ten years. Like skywatchers, they have traced the paths taken by many of these programs, noting especially the direction and movements of the more brilliant stars. Passages of the lesser luminaries await study and description. Information from within, from those who shaped the programs and worked to give them life, has yet to be reported and accumulated. What follows in these pages is a small contribution to that accumulation.

Seven years after instituting its individualized baccalaureate degree program, the faculty of the General College set 1977-1978 as research year. We had developed the program. We had refined it. We had revised its guidelines. But, except for a few studies undertaken by individual researchers, we had not made a comprehensive study of the program and its results. We needed information on which to base answers to questions we, ourselves, had about the program, as well as to questions continually asked of us by students and others. We needed to examine issues surrounding our program, and to gather normative and empirical information about its cost and quality, its demands on time, its effects on institutional change, professional development, faculty workload and rewards, its appropriateness for

our students and its worth to them as a credential in their employment and advanced study.

To get that information, we designed a comprehensive research plan comprised of four studies: 1) a time study of faculty advising, 2) an attitude and opinion survey of faculty, 3) a survey of students admitted to and graduated from the program, and 4) a study of students' progress toward degree and the kinds and amounts of credits granted by the College in the award of baccalaureate degrees. We plan a series of reports on the results of those studies. This report is the first of the series.

Baccalaureate Program Faculty Attitude and Opinion Survey

The subject of this report is the survey made in spring, 1978, of faculty attitude and opinion with respect to baccalaureate programs. Dr. Paul Feltovich, Research Assistant of the General College, designed the questionnaire we used in the study. Dr. Thomas Brothen, Acting Director of the Research Center, guided the compilation of data. The questions we asked, the responses we received, and a computed mean for each item on the questionnaire are shown in the Appendix to this report.

Individualized degree programs throughout the country have been, and continue to be, controversial. Our program is no exception. Points of contention among faculties about these "nontraditional" programs center on basic issues of legitimacy, quality, cost, and the short-term and long-range effects of the programs on professional development and institutional change. The goal of our study was to discover whether, and to what extent, our faculty share these concerns.

We devised a set of questions around those issues. In the questionnaire, we grouped the questions in categories and set them under headings covering 1) quality of programs and of student performance; 2) professional development and satisfaction; 3) institutional change and development; 4) curriculum direction, development, and reform; and 5) program development and change.

Who Took Part in the Survey?

We distributed the questionnaire to all faculty who had been assigned advising responsibilities during fall quarter, 1977 -- a total of 96 persons. Knowing that our questions touched on sensitive issues about which consensus has never been reached in all the years our program has been in effect, we tried to find a way to enable people to answer forthrightly. As a means to that end, we chose anonymity of response. We made and kept our assurance: we did not ask for the usual identifying information; we made no codes, nor any master lists. The only identifying information we sought was a generalized estimate of time in residence which we needed for making comparisons among responses to selected items by groups with varying degrees of experience with the program and its development.

54 persons responded to the questionnaire. Of those, 30 had been employed in the College for six or more years. 14 had been employed for five years or less. One respondent did not answer the question about time in residence. Conceivably, then, 39 of the 54 respondents have had experience with the program throughout its entire history, under its initial 1971 guidelines and under its revised 1976 guidelines as well.

33 of the 54 respondents had been employed in the College for nine or more years. Approximately two-thirds of the total number of respondents had known, and been affiliates of, the College before its metamorphosis from a two-year to a four-year institution. In all likelihood, many had probably participated in some way in the process of transformation. The experience of those 33 respondents dates to the period when the curriculum of the College was confined to 1-level, lower-division courses and study terminated in the Associate in Arts degree.

What Are the Faculty's Perceptions of the Program?

In our interpretation of the data, we began with the penultimate question: Do faculty perceive this program as a valid part of the mission of the College? Study of their responses (IIA, IIIA) reveals that they view the program as appropriate to our endeavor, rather than as a transitory or digressive experience (VAI, 2).

Are they cognizant of the program's potential as an agent for institutional change? Faculty are aware of the relationship that exists between the program and the curriculum (IVB). There seems to be strong agreement about how curriculum development should be guided, and also about discrepancies between the principle and what respondents see as the reality (IVA). Faculty seem generally agreed in their views of the discrepancies: in the development of curriculum, the needs of students in the program should be, but have not been, preeminent (IVAI); the direction of curriculum development and reform should be, but has not been, guided by College-level policy (IVA5). They are strongly agreed on the curricular areas most in need of further development: humanities, communication systems, and interdisciplinary studies (IVC).

Do faculty have confidence in the quality of student-planned programs? They seem to have greater confidence in the quality of students' planning of programs (IBI, 4) than in the ability of students to perform or demonstrate particular skills that are integral to the programs (IA), as for example, writing (IA1), oral communication (IA2), and the ability to apply classroom experience to real-world problems (IA4). Nor do faculty see any difference in quality in those areas between the work of students under 1971, and those under 1976, guidelines. In conceptual ability, faculty see only slight improvement in students under 1976, over those under 1971, guidelines as reflected in their work with abstract concepts (IA3), and in the planning, organizing, and carrying out of their individualized educational programs (IA3,5,6).

Does the program need refinement? Most faculty believe the application process can be simplified (VA3). Most agree on the need for clarification of criteria for judging Senior Reports (VA4). Most favor the requirement of a minimum N.P.A. for admission to the baccalaureate program of about C7; most would prefer it be computed on the student's last 45 credits prior to admission (VB). Most favor the requirement of a minimum N.P.A. for graduation from the baccalaureate program of about C7; most would prefer it be computed on the last 90 credits prior to graduation (VC).

Has the Program Affected Professional Development?

Faculty agree that the program contributes to their professional satisfaction and provides them expanded professional opportunity (IIA). Although most respondents seem to believe their long-term involvement

with the program will be, at best, only somewhat beneficial (IIC), they, nonetheless, want to learn more about the program and are strongly agreed about the need for in-service training in its various aspects (IID,E). They seem to derive intrinsic rewards from their involvement (IIA,B). They are strongly agreed about the insufficiency of extrinsic rewards for their work in the program (IIB2).

Comparison of responses among groups of faculty with varying lengths of experience in the College reveals the middle group, those with 6-8 years, strongly agreed on the importance of the baccalaureate program to their professional satisfaction (IIAlb-7b, col.2). The 0-5 year group is next in order in strength of agreement (IIAlb-7b, col.1), with the group of 9 or more years' experience ranked last (IIAlb-7b, col.3).

Recognition and compensation by the College for work in the baccalaureate program seem most nearly sufficient to those faculty with 9 or more years' experience (IIB2, col. 3).

Conclusion

Finally, the ultimate question: Is there faculty support for continuing the program? Faculty seem to believe the need exists for such a program at the University of Minnesota (IB3, IIIA2). They seem to value the program as a legitimate part of our mission (IIIA), and most agree that the program has been a beneficial step for the College (IIIA6). Although most rate our upper division courses as only adequate (IVD), and upper division course offerings as unevenly sufficient (IVB), faculty -- particularly those with eight or fewer years of experience in the College -- seem interested in working toward the improvement of curricular offerings. Strongest support for the program as a means of professional satisfaction and development exists among faculty with 6-8 years of experience.

i. How long have you been an employee of the General College?

The responses were:

1 = 0 to 5 years	14
2 = 6 to 8 years	6
3 = 9 or more years	33

I. Baccalaureate Programs Students

IA. Compared to your personal standard for the minimum quality of performance which a person earning a General College baccalaureate degree should be able to demonstrate, how would you rate the typical General College baccalaureate program student on the following skills? For each skill, rate students before academic year 76-77 and students during 76-78 separately.

1 = much less than adequate
2 = less than adequate
3 = adequate
4 = better than adequate
5 = much better than adequate
*6 = no opinion

IA.	1	2	3	4	5	*6	Mean
1. Writing							
-Before 76-77	4	11	19	3	0	16	2.67
-During 76-78	3	16	18	8	0	9	2.69
2. Oral Communication							
-Before 76-77	0	4	19	12	0	18	3.23
-During 76-78	1	3	25	12	0	13	3.17
3. Working with Abstract Concepts							
-Before 76-77	3	9	20	0	0	20	2.50
*-During 76-78	1	15	19	5	0	13	2.70
4. Application of Classroom Experience to Real-World Problems							
-Before 76-77	0	4	18	14	1	16	3.30
-During 76-78	0	8	18	16	2	10	3.27
5. Ability to Plan, Organize, and Carry Out Educational Experience Independently							
-Before 76-77	4	12	12	11	0	14	2.77
*-During 76-78	5	10	12	20	0	7	3.00
6. General Ability to do Upper-Division College Work							
-Before 76-77	1	7	22	6	0	17	2.92
*-During 76-78	0	4	22	16	1	10	3.30

IB. Most of the programs designed by students in the baccalaureate programs:

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = mildly disagree
4 = mildly agree
5 = agree
6 = strongly agree
*7 = no opinion

IB.	1	2	3	4	5	6	*7	Mean
1. Represent a cohesive program of courses and experiences with a clearly discernible focus. (focus)	0	3	8	11	26	4	1	4.39
2. Represent a program of courses and experiences that is designed and planned by students in advance of their actually doing most of the work in the last 90 credits of their program. (planning)	1	5	9	15	15	4	4	4.02
3. Represent a program of courses and experiences that the student could not pursue elsewhere at the University of Minnesota. (uniqueness)	1	3	3	9	22	14	1	4.73
4. With regard to work planned in the programs, are of academic quality consistent with my personal standards for the earning of a baccalaureate degree. (quality)	1	3	10	9	25	4	1	4.27

II. Professional Satisfaction and Development

IIA. Rate the extent you believe the following activities are provided to you by the existence of the baccalaureate programs, their importance to your professional satisfaction, and the extent to which you believe that your opportunity to engage in each would be substantially diminished if the baccalaureate programs did not exist in the General College.

IIA. (continued)

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = mildly disagree
4 = mildly agree
5 = agree
6 = strongly agree
*7 = no opinion

IIA.	1	2	3	4	5	6	*7	Mean
1. Professional interaction with an academically mature and able group of students								
-existence provides	2	3	0	18	22	6	3	4.43
-important activity	1	5	1	10	16	18	3	4.75
-opportunity diminished	4	7	4	5	10	20	3	4.40
2. Development and teaching of upper-division courses or courses academically similar to upper-division courses								
-existence provides	1	3	2	10	15	17	6	4.79
-important activity	2	5	3	12	14	14	4	4.46
-opportunity diminished	5	3	2	3	12	24	4	4.76
3. Advising on substantial student research projects								
-existence provides	2	2	2	16	20	7	4	4.45
-important activity	2	6	5	7	18	3	2	4.41
-opportunity diminished	2	4	8	7	18	9	5	4.29
4. Helping students design and carry out personally tailored programs of study								
-existence provides	2	0	2	11	20	14	5	4.82
-important activity	3	3	4	15	17	10	2	4.40
-opportunity diminished	2	5	2	10	15	16	4	4.58
5. Teaching in expanded settings (eg, Rochester, prisons, CEE)								
-existence provides	4	5	5	8	12	6	13	3.93
-important activity	7	4	5	7	11	11	8	3.98
-opportunity diminished	5	6	4	12	8	6	12	3.73
6. Exploring new areas of knowledge								
-existence provides	8	6	2	14	11	9	4	3.82
-important activity	1	0	1	6	17	27	2	5.29
-opportunity diminished	14	5	8	4	10	8	5	3.31
7. Exploring new aspects of the world of work								
-existence provides	3	4	1	12	17	8	6	4.33
-important activity	4	3	3	13	14	10	4	4.28
-opportunity diminished	5	6	7	6	12	7	8	3.81

IIA. (Questions 1b-7b): For the following activities, rate the extent . . . of their importance to your professional satisfaction . . . . . Mean:

	Column 1 0-5 years Faculty	Column 2 6-8 years Faculty	Column 3 9 or more years Faculty
1. Professional interaction with an academically mature and able group of students	4.9	5.7	4.6
2. Development and teaching of upper-division courses or courses academically similar to upper-division courses	4.8	5.3	4.3
3. Advising on substantial student research projects	4.7	5.5	4.2
4. Helping students design and carry out personally tailored programs of study	4.7	5.0	4.1
5. Teachings in expanded settings (eg, Rochester, prisons, CEE)	4.1	4.7	3.7
6. Exploring new areas of knowledge	5.3	5.8	5.2
7. Exploring new aspects of the world of work	4.6	4.5	4.0

IIB. Rate the extent to which you agree/disagree with the following statements.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = mildly disagree
4 = mildly agree
5 = agree
6 = strongly agree
*7 = no opinion

IIB.		1	2	3	4	5	6	*7	Mean
1.	The baccalaureate programs make such a demand on my time that other aspects of my professional life have suffered	13	12	8	9	5	2	4	2.74
2.	My work with the baccalaureate programs is sufficiently recognized and compensated by the College	16	10	9	3	8	1	7	2.57
3.	I have difficulty helping baccalaureate programs students design their individualized programs	6	11	11	11	6	2	7	3.13
4.	I have difficulty helping baccalaureate programs students refine their career and educational goals	7	12	10	11	5	4	5	3.14
5.	I have difficulty helping baccalaureate programs students utilize resources in colleges outside the General College or in the community	9	14	11	8	1	1	10	2.57
6.	I have difficulty working with baccalaureate programs students' emotional problems engendered by aspects of individualized education	11	14	9	4	5	1	10	2.57

IIB(2).		Column 1 0-5 years Faculty	Column 2 6-8 years Faculty	Column 3 9 or more years Faculty
My work with the baccalaureate programs is sufficiently recognized and compensated by the College	Mean:	1.5	2.0	3.1

IIC(1) Faculty members were asked to respond to a statement about the degree to which they felt that their long-term involvement with baccalaureate programs as now structured, will affect their professional development.

The responses were:

1 = highly detrimental	1
2 = somewhat detrimental	5
3 = little or no effect	15
4 = somewhat beneficial	18
5 = highly beneficial	9
*6 = no opinion	6

Mean = 3.60

IIC(2)

	Column 1 0-5 years Faculty	Column 2 6-8 years Faculty	Column 3 9 or more years Faculty
I believe that my long-term involvement with the baccalaureate program, as now structured, will have the following effect on my professional development:			
Mean:	3.61	3.80	3.58

IID. I believe that there should be substantially more in-service training for faculty members than now exists in the following aspects of the baccalaureate program.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = mildly disagree
4 = mildly agree
5 = agree
6 = strongly agree
*7 = no opinion

IID.

		1	2	3	4	5	6	*7	Mean
1.	Student program requirements	1	4	2	9	23	11	4	4.64
2.	Admission procedures	2	5	4	9	15	14	4	4.47
3.	Graduation procedures	1	5	3	7	20	14	4	4.64
4.	External (outside GC) resources available to students	1	5	3	7	22	11	5	4.57
5.	Helping students design individually tailored programs	4	5	4	6	20	10	5	4.29
6.	Helping students define individual career or educational goals	2	7	4	10	15	11	5	4.27

IIE. Faculty members were also asked to choose the two categories above for which there is the greatest need for more in-service training.

Categories	# of People Who Feel There is Greatest Need in this Category	# of People Who Feel There is 2nd Greatest Need
1	13	7
2	8	8
3	7	6
4	5	4
5	7	8
6	5	9

III. Institutional Change and Development

IIIA. Rate the extent to which you agree/disagree with the following statements about the baccalaureate program in the General College.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = mildly disagree
4 = mildly agree
5 = agree
6 = strongly agree
*7 = no opinion

IIIA.	1	2	3	4	5	6	*7	Mean
1. The baccalaureate programs contributed substantially to expanding the GC outreach program (eg, new populations, new localities)	0	3	3	13	16	16	3	4.77
2. The baccalaureate programs address a need for their type of program that exists at the University of Minnesota.	0	1	2	10	16	20	5	5.06
3. The existence of the baccalaureate programs helps ensure the long-range viability of the General College.	5	2	4	7	11	18	7	4.91
4. The existence of baccalaureate programs students has raised the quality of academic inquiry in the course offerings of the College.	4	4	7	5	11	14	9	4.27
5. The existence of baccalaureate programs students has raised the quality of discussion in the course offerings of the College.	3	4	5	9	8	12	13	4.24

Mean of the means = 4.71

IV. Curriculum

IVA. Rate the following on the extent to which you believe they <u>have</u> shaped the development of upper division course offerings in the College and also the extent to which you believe they <u>should</u>.

1 = hardly at all
2 = not much
3 = somewhat
4 = considerably
5 = very greatly
*6 = no opinion

IVA.		1	2	3	4	5	*6	Mean
1.	The needs of the GC students in the baccalaureate program							
	-have directed	1	7	16	18	5	5	3.40
	-should direct	0	0	5	19	26	3	4.42
2.	The expertise of individual faculty members							
	-has directed	1	2	13	17	13	6	3.85
	-should direct	0	3	11	19	15	5	3.96
3.	The interests of individual faculty members							
	-have directed	0	2	7	14	24	5	4.28
	-should direct	0	1	20	17	11	4	3.78
4.	Policy that exists at the divisional level for the direction of curriculum development and reform							
	-has directed	4	9	10	15	4	10	3.14
	-should direct	0	1	14	22	12	4	3.98
5.	Policy that exists at the College level for the direction of curriculum development and reform							
	-has directed	11	8	11	10	3	9	2.67
	-should direct	1	1	12	18	16	4	3.98

IVB. Faculty members were asked to rate the sufficiency of General College upper division course offerings. They were asked to endorse 1 of 3 statements about the upper division curriculum. The responses were:

1.	Generally deficient; most GC course needs cannot be met here	5
2.	Spotty; some areas are sufficient, other deficient	35
3.	Generally sufficient; most GC course needs can be met here	7
*4.	No opinion	3

IVC. Faculty members were asked to select three categories of course offerings from a list of 12. They were to rank them 1-3 in order of their need to be expanded at the upper division level to meet the needs of baccalaureate students.

Category	Number of #1 Rankings	Number of #2 Rankings	Number of #3 Rankings
1. The individual and nature	3	6	1
2. The individual and society	4	3	2
3. Humanities	13	4	1
4. Communication systems	11	5	5
5. The individual and work	4	8	3
6. Personal life	2	2	6
7. Coordinated studies (American Indian and Afro-American)	4	4	2
8. Contemporary race relations	0	2	4
9. Developing educational plans	0	4	6
10. Environmental problems	0	0	3
11. Interdisciplinary studies (eg. the Toward a Good Life model)	8	9	8
12. Minnesota studies	0	0	0

IVD. Faculty members were asked to compare their personal standard of academic quality for upper division courses to current upper division offerings of the General College. The responses were:

1 = much less than adequate	0
2 = less than adequate	9
3 = adequate	24
4 = better than adequate	9
5 = much better than adequate	0
*6 = no opinion	10

Mean = 3.0

V. Program Development and Change

VA. To what extent do you agree/disagree with the following statements:

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = mildly disagree
4 = mildly agree
5 = agree
6 = strongly agree
*7 = no opinion

VA.	1	2	3	4	5	6	*7	Mean
1. As the baccalaureate programs have developed and requirements for the degrees have changed, the programs have moved away from the student population the General College has traditionally served.	1	12	6	14	8	5	8	3.67
2. As the baccalaureate programs have developed and requirements for the degrees have changed, the programs have moved away from the student population these programs should be serving.	6	14	11	7	7	4	4	3.14
3. The application process for the baccalaureate programs is more complex than it needs to be.	2	5	5	13	17	19	3	4.47

VA. (continued)	1	2	3	4	5	6	*7	Mean
4. There should be more objective criteria than now exist for use in judging the acceptability of baccalaureate programs senior reports.	1	4	9	10	10	14	6	4.38
5. The standards for acceptability for baccalaureate programs senior reports should be raised.	6	9	7	8	6	4	13	3.29

VB. Faculty members were asked if there should be any minimum NPA requirement for admission to baccalaureate programs. The responses were:

yes	37
no	8
not sure	8

Those answering yes were asked which pre-admission work the NPA should cover. The responses were:

all work before admission	5
last 60 credits prior to admission	6
last 45 credits prior to admission	16
last 30 credits prior to admission	8
last quarter prior to admission	1

Those answering yes were also asked what the minimum NPA should be. The responses were:

D4	0
C5	2
C6	15
C7	16
B8	4
B9	1
A10	0
A11	0

Mean = (C) 6.66

VC. Faculty members were asked if there should be any minimum NPA requirement for graduation from baccalaureate programs. The responses were:

yes	45
no	4
not sure	5

VC. (continued)

Those answering yes were asked which work it should cover. The responses were:

all work for student prior to graduation	6
last 90 credits prior to graduation	30
only work in the core	9

Those answering yes were also asked what the minimum NPA should be. The responses were:

D4	0
C5	4
C6	9
C7	28
B8	4
B9	1
A10	0
A11	0

Mean = (C) 6.76

UNIV[illegible]

JUN 15 1979

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES